



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/556,398	11/10/2005	Francois Droz	90500-000067/US	6278
30593 7590 08/19/2008 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195				
EXAMINER				
MAI, THIEN T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2887				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/556,398

Applicant(s)

DROZ, FRANCOIS

Examiner

Thien T. Mai

Art Unit

2887

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 November 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-856)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement

Acknowledgement is hereby made of the preliminary amendment filed 5/07/2008.

Objections

Claim 3 line 1: "the layer" lacks antecedent basis. Please clarify which (i.e. in claim 1 or claim 2) this is referring to.

Claim 12 line 4: "said substrate" lacks antecedent basis. Please clarify which substrate (i.e. in claim 1 or claim 11) this is referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim(s) 1, 9-10 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halope (US 6,851,618)

Halope discloses a method comprising:

- placing the substrate on a work surface, the face including conductive tracks 18 (Fig. 1, 4) being oriented upwards, - placing the electronic component 26,40 into a cavity of the substrate situated in a zone including the conductive tracks, the conductive areas of the electronic component coming into contact with the corresponding conductive tracks of the substrate, and

- applying a layer of insulating material which extends concurrently on the electronic component and at least on the zone of the substrate surrounding said electronic component, wherein the conductive areas of the electronic component and the conductive tracks of the substrate are in contact to achieve an electric connection via a pressure of application of the insulating material layer on the electronic component, and configured to rub together when repeated stresses are exerted on the substrate (col. 4 lines 19-38: electronic component 40 contacts are in connection with antenna without using glue and Fig. 4-6 show insulating material covers the entire electronic component 40 and its surrounding; although not expressly described, it would have been obvious that at least a small rubbing/friction would occur at the chip contacts with the antenna while repeated stresses are exerted due to pressure on the electronic component and hot injection of fluid(s); further comprising a supplementary step of gluing using glue 60 (fig 5).

Re claim 9, the cavity is formed by milling (col. 3 lines 18+)

Re claim 10, the contact areas of the chip showing on the surface level of the substrate where they make contact with antenna (Fig. 5).

2. Claim(s) 2-8, 11-14 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halope (US 6,851,618) in view of Fidalgo (5,598,032)

Halope lacks the contact extensions limitations.

Fidalgo discloses the chip electrodes are set off on at least a conductive film 13, 12 that extends the contacts of the chip thereby creating an extended area for each chip contact which includes items 11-13; the module 7 comprising an insulation 14 which has

a cavity for the chip(Fig. 1, 5, 7); the contact areas 11-13 connecting with corresponding area of a second substrate having the antenna conductors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the contact extension method and related teachings of Fidalgo so that the extension and the shape of the electronic component could accommodate a desired cavity design configuration.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Hoppe et al. (4457798), Rutsche (6542444), Haghiri-Tehrani (5880934), Hirai et al. (6607135, 6160526), Kim et al (20030226901).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thien T. Mai whose telephone number is 571-272-8283. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve S. Paik can be reached on 571-272-2404. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thien T Mai/
Examiner, Art Unit 2887

/Thien M. Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2887